REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Lechat *et al.* (U.S. 6,999,629) ("Lechat") in view of Fowler *et al.* (U.S. 6,339,428) ("Fowler"). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lechat in view of Fowler, and further in view of Zandi *et al.* (U.S. 6,219,458) ("Zandi"). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lechat in view of Fowler and further in view Mochizuki *et al.* (U.S. 5,903,273) (" Mochizuki"). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lechat in view of in view of Fowler and further in view of "Resample Hardware for 3D Graphics" by Meinds and Barenbrug, (herein "Resample Hardware"). Applicant respectfully traverses of all these grounds of rejection for the reasons indicated herein below.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite in part:

> an intermediate intensity value based on a filtering operation of texels surrounding the input transformed point and a distance therefrom; and
> wherein said input transformed point in the input triangle is not located on a grid of texels with integer coordinates.

Support is found in the specification at least at page 6, lines 8-10, and shown in FIG. 2. Thus, according to the claimed invention, for an intermediate point p0 (n) of the intermediate rectangle triangle T0, n being an integer, an input transformed point p1 (n) in the input triangle T1 is obtained by using the inverse affine transform, wherein the input transformed point p1 (n) belong to the input triangle is not located on a grid of texels with integer coordinates.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Lechat and Fowler fails to disclose or render obvious at least the above-recitation in amended claims 1 and 9. With regard to the combination of Lechat and Fowler, Applicant respectfully submits that with reference to Lechat, page 3 of the Office Action states at line 1 "[A] triangle is a set of points" and Lechat in combination with Fowler, fails to disclose or render obvious at least the claimed recitation, as Fowler does not discuss an input transformed point as claimed.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 is overcome.

With regard to the rejections of the claims dependent from one of claims 1 or 9, Applicant also respectfully submits that the addition of any of the other cited references to the combination of Lechat and Fowler (or just one of Lechat or Fowler) still would not render the independent claims obvious at the time of invention, at least for the reasons indicated above, and the additional recitations of the dependent claims. Nor would the combination of elements, as recited in any of the claims, have been obvious at the time of invention as being within the ordinary level of skill in the art ((*KSR International v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Waxler
Registration No. 48,027

Date: December 3, 2008

/Steve Cha/
By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:
Aaron Waxler, Registration No. 48,027
NXP, B.V.
NXP Intellectual Property Department
M/S41-SJ
1109 McKay Drive
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 434-3000
Fax: (408) 474-9081